

## REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-23, and 25-61 are pending. By this amendment, independent claims 1, 21 and 40 are amended to include subject matter previously claimed in dependent claims and to ensure compliance with section 101 as discussed with the Examiners. Claims 5, 9, 25, 29, 41-57 and 60 are also amended for clarity and correction. New claim 61 is added. No range of equivalents is intended to be surrendered by these non-narrowing amendments. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 6-13, 15-20, 40, 43, 45-51, 53-58 and 60 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al in view of Eddy et al. Claims 21-23, 26-27, 37, 39 and 59 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al in view of Eddy et al. further in view of Gupta et al. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al in view of Eddy et al. further in view of Gupta et al. in further view of Li. Claims 2-3, 14, 41-42 and 52 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being upatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al in view of Eddy et al. further in view of Li. Claims 5 and 44 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al in view of Eddy et al. further in view of Chang. Claims 24-25 and 28-36 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goerz, Jr. et al in view of Eddy et al. further in view of Gupta et al. in further view of Chang. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for reasons previously stated and because Eddy and Goerz do not teach each and every element of independent claims 1, 21 and 40. The additional references do not overcome these defects.

Applicants have conducted numerous interviews with Examiners Stevens and Alam since issuance of the office action with the goal of allowing the present application. On October 31, 2006, Applicant Bascom and representative Wooden conducted in-person interview with Examiners Stevens and Alam. Bascom and Wooden showed how the claims, prior to the current amendments, overcame Goerz and Eddy. Examiner Alam then presented a proposed double-patenting rejection in view of Applicants' patent 7,111,232. Examiner Alam made clear that double-patenting rejection was his main concern and did not discuss the prior art rejections. Applicants then proposed arguments and amendments to overcome the proposed double-patenting rejection. Over the course of a number of telephonic interviews, Examiners Alam and Stevens discussed the proposed amendments and requested the inclusion in the independent


claims of language from dependent claims 4 and 9 to overcome the rejections. After the Applicants proposed claim amendments to implement these requested changes, Examiners Alam and Stevens told Applicants' representative Wooden, during a January 29, 2007 telephonic interview, that the independent claims, would be unpatentable under section 101. Examiner Alam stated that including the language "providing a link reference to a user" would overcome their section 101 concerns. Accordingly, Applicants proposed claims amendments with this language. Subsequently, on or about February 12, 2007, Applicants' representative Wooden was told in a telephone call from Examiner Stevens that Examiner Alam had stated that inclusion of the "displaying", as recited above in claims 1 and 40, would be necessary to overcome the section 101 rejection and place the claims in condition for allowance. Consequently, Applicants faxed an amendment to Examiner Stevens implementing this amendment. Subsequently, on or about March 12, 2007, Examiner Stevens informed Wooden during a telephone call that Examiner Alam was not going to allow the claims. Representative Wooden called Examiner Alam and left a voice mail requesting further information as to Examiner Alam's reasons for not allowing the claims. Examiner Alam has not returned representative Wooden's call.

In light of the above, it is believed that the claims, as currently amended, overcome the prior art and all double-patenting and section 101 rejections of record and not of record. It is noted that not once during the four months of discussions from October 31, 2006 to March 2007 did Examiners Alam or Stevens attempt to maintain, or even raise, the rejections based on Eddy or Goerz et al. The entire course of discussions made clear that these rejections had been overcome and that the outstanding issues were the double-patenting and section 101 rejections that Examiner Alam had raised. Consequently, it is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: March 30, 2007

---

Sean S. Wooden  
Registration No. 43,997  
Andrews Kurth LLP  
1350 I Street, N.W.  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Tel. (202) 662-2738  
Fax (202) 662-2739